MANITOBA ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL

Manitoba

ANNUAL REPORT
15:1987

MANITOBA
ENVIRONMENTAL
COUNCIL

MANITOBA ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
Box 17
Room 550
500 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3C 3X1

May 9, 1988

The Honorable E. Connery
Minister of Environment and
Workplace Safety and Health
Room 156 Legislative Building
450 Broadway Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

Dear Mr. Connery:

I have the honor to present herewith Annual Report 15:1987 of the Environment Council.

This report details the Council's activities during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1987, and includes information regarding the Annual Meeting on May 29, 1987.

Yours truly,

Dr. I. Rollo
MEC Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
REPORT OF THE CHAIR	
Diane Malley	1
REPORT OF THE VICE-CHAIR	
Ian Rollo	4
DEPUTY MINISTER'S ADDRESS	
Tom Owen	5
COORDINATOR'S REPORT	
Keri Barringer	10
REGIONAL REPORTS	
Interlake	10
Northern	11
Pembina Valley	12
Western	13
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORTS	
Energy	14
Wildlife	14
Environmental Impact Assessment	15
BRIEFS	
1. Protection of Drinking Water Sources in Manitoba	16
2. Snow Dumping Practices in the City of Winnipeg	19
3. New Environmental Legislation for the Province	19
4. Parks Branch, Sewage Lagoon, Clearwater Lake Provincial Park	22
5. Smelter Stack Emission Regulation	23
6. Larviciding of Mosquitoes	24
7. Monitoring for the Presence of Western Equine Encephalitis (WEE) Antibodies in Birds.	25
RESPONSES TO BRIEFS 1986-87	
Atish Maniar	26
PUBLICATIONS	
Report - Herold Driedger	28
Publications List	29
MEMBERSHIP	
Report - Olga Weber	30
Membership List	30
Council Organizations	31
ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS	
Report of Nominating Committee	32
Past Council Chairs	32
Council Staff	32
FINANCES AND ADMINISTRATION	
Financial Data	33
Expenditures 1986-87	33
Colophon	33

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Diane F. Malley

The year 1986-87 was an atypical one in the Council's history. This was largely due to the tabling in the Legislature by the Minister on 10 September 1986 of a discussion bill entitled the Manitoba Environmental Act. This began an extensive period of public consultation in which the Council participated actively, as did many other individuals and groups across the province. The Council viewed the draft Act as a significant advance in environmental legislation for several reasons. It encompassed many of the on-going concerns of Council such as the embodiment of environmental impact assessment in legislation and regulations, broadening of the scope of the types of environmental impacts dealt with, and in covering developments in the public as well as private sector. Nevertheless, the Act strongly affected the MEC as well as the CEC by proposing to combine the two bodies into the Manitoba Environmental Commission. A good deal of Council's energy during the year was devoted to examining the draft Act. One of the direct results of this activity was a strengthening of Council's definition of itself and of what members viewed as requirements for the Council to continue to serve as a citizen's advisory body to the Minister.

The Council participated in the public consultation process surrounding the draft Act in several ways. In a letter of 26 November 1986 to the Minister, Council argued for the preservation of the Council as an independent citizen's advisory body to the Minister. At that time the Council also urged that public hearings be held on the draft Act. On 31 December 1986 Council addressed the results of its extensive study of the

Board of Directors, Annual Meeting,May 29, 1987 from left to right:1st Row - K. Barringer, E. Johanson, B. Pawlicki, C. Howlett, D. Malley, B. Aitken, A. Maniar, D. Muldrew, H. Arklie; 2nd Row - B. Turnock, I. Rollo, B. Rotoff, H. Driedger, M. Egan, B. Wild, R. Howard.

draft Act to the Minister. Council's general comments centered on four points: the need for statement of overall purpose, policy or guiding principals; the need for more definition of the environmental impact assessment process; retention of the Manitoba Environmental Council and the need for clear indication of the avenues for public input and participation. As Chair of the Council, I commented on the Act on CBC Information Radio on 12 September 1986 and Council member, Tim Fultz, and I participated on CBC Radio Questionnaire on 23 September. Energy Committee Chair, Martin Egan prepared a critique for the Environmental Law Centre Newsletter, Vol. 4, No. 4, 2 November 1986. Council prepared comments for the Fall 1986 Bulletin of the Manitoba Environmental Network. I read a brief to the public hearings held by the Manitoba Environmental Network and Manitoba Environmentalists, Inc. on 14 March 1987.

Just days before this meeting, 27 May 1987, Bill 26, the Manitoba Environment Act was introduced into the legislature for second reading. There are very substantial changes in

the legislation compared with the draft Act of 10 September 1986. This clearly reflects not only that environmental groups and the public spoke out on their visions of environmental legislation in Manitoba but also that the Department listened. In Bill 26, developments are categorized into three classes each with its own licensing procedures, many of the powers of the director are modified, closer communication between the MEC and CEC are called for, and the contents of the public registry have been defined more fully. It is gratifying today to be able to report that the Manitoba Environmental Council not only will continue to exist but will be named in legislation. The Clean Environment Commission and the Council are retained as separate bodies. Yet there is still work required by the new executive to suggest changes as the legislation passes through the Law Amendments Committee. The essence of the Act is in the designation of class of development, but the nature of the developments included in the three classes is not spelled out in the Act. This makes it extremely difficult to comment on the appropriateness of the licensing procedures for the three classes. A second major drawback of the legislation is the absence of a requirement for public hearings to be held during the licensing process regardless of the scale of a development. The provision in the Clean Environment Act for affected private citizens to be able to precipitate a public hearing has been lost. Thirdly, there is no indication that in the legislation that any reports of hearings or investigations conducted under the Act must be made available to the public.

Action on the Manitoba Environment Act has been only one area of Council activities. More than ever before in its history the Council participated in public hearings held by the Clean Environment Commission. The CEC specifically invited the Council's input on a number of topics. First, Council presented its brief on the hazardous waste management process at 10 of the 11 Stage II hearings of the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Management Program. This required participation of a number of Council members from both within and outside of Winnipeg. Their participation is gratefully acknowledged. We also acknowledge funds provided by the Department for the purpose of providing Council members travel for the preparation and presentation of the brief.

On 13 April 1987 the Council presented a brief at Clean Environment Commission hearings on the Clearwater Lake Provincial Park Sewage Lagoon. This matter is interesting in that it involved prior exchange of position papers with a number of other groups and individuals presenting briefs on the subject. The almost uniform position taken by the Council and the other groups undoubtedly influenced the decision at the conclusion of the hearings to keep the sewage lagoon out of the Clearwater Lake watershed.

The Council is currently presenting a brief on the SO2 Regulations for Manitoba at CEC hearings. That brief is likely to make a unique contribution to the hearings by suggesting that there should not only be emissions controls for Manitoba but also deposition standards.

National events have influenced Council's activities in this term. Following the meetings of the World Commission on Environment and Development (also called the Brundtland Commission after its

Chair) held in several cities in Canada in late May and early June 1986, the Minister, Mr. Gerard Lecuyer, proposed to the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers that there be a Canadian response to this Commission. The National Task Force on Economy and Environment composed of 17 Environment Ministers, heads of private sector corporations and organizations and representatives from the academic community and environmental organizations was initiated by CCREM. Its first meeting was held in Winnipeg on 18 February 1987 and it presented its report to CCREM in Quebec City on 26 September 1987. On 26 March 1987, I represented the Council at a meeting with members of the Secretariat of the National Task Force, the Chair of the Clean Environment Commission and a representative from the Department of Natural Resources to plan an event which would demonstrate Manitoba's activity in the area of the provincial conservation strategy. As a result on 23 May 1987 I convened an organizational meeting on the provincial conservation strategy effort in Manitoba attended by 25 people from diverse backgrounds, including 7 members of Council. We gratefully acknowledge the support from the Secretariat of the National Task Force to cover costs for that meeting. The meeting agreed that 1. the provincial conservation strategy (PCS) is a philosophy and a process, 2. that the philosophy is the ecosystem approach, 3. that the goal of the PCS is to find means to implement the ecosystem approach by society, 4. that fundamental change is necessary but that it must be accomplished through a series of practical, simple, easily-implemented steps, 5. that the process is timely now and that the process of change involved taking risks and 6. the process requires making the ecosystem real to people. Two resolutions resulted from that meeting. One was that an ad hoc committee be established, from among the participants of the 23 May 1987 meeting, and that the ad hoc participants committee associate with the Manitoba Environmental Council until such time as the ad hoc committee adopts another format. The second resolution was that the ad hoc committee of 23 May 1987 be empowered to crystallize its objectives with respect to the PCS effort and to consider the organization needed to contribute to the PCS in Manitoba.

Two other Council activities associated with the PCS are underway. One is the public forum on Energy in Manitoba and the Provincial Conservation Strategy being held in conjunction with this annual meeting tonight and tomorrow. Secondly, in June 1987 a tour of northern communities is planned to share with local residents national and provincial developments towards conservation strategies and to hear their environmental and resource management concerns.

Also at the national level, on 24-26 September 1986, Past Chair, Dr. Atish Maniar, and I attended the 10th Assembly of Environment Councils, hosted by the Environment Council of Alberta. We presented a written report which has been included in Environment Council of Alberta 1986, "Proceedings: 10th Annual Joint Meeting of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Councils", Edmonton, 78 + 3 pp. Major topics discussed at the Assembly were the development of provincial conservation strategies and the environmental implications of free trade.

The Council could not have participated so fully and achieved so much without the energies, committment and skills of its Coordinator Keri Barringer; the other members of the Executive, Dr. Ian Rollo, Herold

Driedger and Dr. Atish Maniar; the members of the Board and other Council members. I thank you all for the extra level of effort that made the difference. Financial support for the Council is far below past levels, so far in fact, that the semi-annual meeting usually in December was not held in 1986. The additional funds for public hearing participation and the 23 May 1987 meeting are gratefully acknowledged. It is clear to me that although much has been done with a minimum level of funding, the consolidation and continuation of efforts we have begun requires more funding than Council presently has. This is required to at least maintain communication, allow travel to meetings, allow Regional Committees to function and to continue public forums.

It has been a remarkable year not only in Council's history but also in provincial history. New environmental legislation for the province, Manitoba's leadership on the National Task Force on Environment and Economy and the beginnings of grassroots activities towards a Manitoba Conservation Strategy all served to make this year challenging and rewarding. I wish the new executive such a year as they take office and as events further unfold.

Presented at the 29 May 1987 Annual Meeting.

REPORT OF THE VICE-CHAIR

Dr. Ian Rollo

It's at year's end that one looks back and reflects on earlier and optimistic aims and objectives, and wonders if much has been achieved. I've done that and concluded, a conclusion which I believe will be borne out by the subsequent proceedings, that despite severe fiscal restraints, the Council has achieved much that it set to out do. I hasten to point out, however, that what has been achieved is not the result of undue effort on my behalf. The Council has been served so exceptionally well by Diane Malley working well beyond what might be regarded as expected effort in our purely voluntary organization, that calls on my time have been very modest. Apart from participation in Executive and Board meetings, I have represented Council at a social evening prior to the first meeting of the Task Force on the Environment and Economy, a body chaired by our Minister that will report in the Fall, and addressed the Winnipeg Council of Women on the activities of the Council and on the proposed new environmental legislation. With regards to the first, I must report a feeling of optimism engendered by mingling with those captains of industry and movers and shakers of politics chosen to deliberate the matter; on the second, it was gratifying to be able to enlighten some members of the public, otherwise, well-informed and interested in many areas affecting their lives, about our efforts to care for their environment. I have mentioned our constrained resources and must point out that a major consequence of this policy is the prohibition to a very large extent of the participation of those rural members whose contributions have been so valuable in the past.

It would be wrong of me to gloss over the time and effort spent in, first, assessing the consequences of the proposed changes in Provincial environmental legislation, and secondly, in advocating such changes and amendments that we felt were in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. A first glimpse of Bill 26, as it was tabled the other day, indicates that many of the concerns of

ourselves and others have been accounted for in the proposed legislation. As pointed out, it is not before time that changes in legislation were made. Recent reports on Provincial Governments' commitment to maintaining and improving environmental quality finds Manitoba far from the top of the heap.

One item of material other than provincial concern that was discussed in Council was changes in the legislation relating to the irradiation of food and the concern of various groups about the safety of the process under the conditions outlined. Unfortunately, as may happen, credible and responsible individuals and organizations moving in and out of one related issue after another, and like everyone else being fallible, occasionally size what they sincerely believe as an appropriate matter for attack and exposure, where in fact their points had already been considered and resolved or dismissed. Such advocacy tends to bias and emotion rather than dispassionate objectivity. In the past, under the Codex Alimentarious Commission of the U. N. sponsored World Food Standards Programme, a Joint Expert Committee on Food Irradiation meeting in 1983, adopted revised standards which, among other provisions, gave a clear bill of health to any food application up to and including one million units and formally reclassified the process as a "process" and no longer as an additive. Further to this, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration; published in April 18, 1986, Federal Register amended regulations permitting additional uses of ionizing radiation for the treatment of food. In an exhaustive critique of comments and criticism of the proposal, it concluded that the analysis reduced the uncertainty about the safety of the process to the point that it can reasonably be concluded, that no harm will result from the proposed use. In the meantime in Ottawa, the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Committee has recommended that the process be limited to those foods and doses now approved by current legislation until an in-depth scientific assessment of health implications and further toxicological studies indicate that no significant adverse health effects would be expected to be found. Your Council will keep watching and prepare a brief on the matter if appropriate. The Provincial Government will provide any comments or recommendations which, through its studies, it feels are relevant.

Presented at the May 29, 1987, Annual Council Meeting.

DEPUTY MINISTER'S REPORT
Dr. Tom Owen

I bring greetings from the Minister. As late as 9:15 this morning, we were trying to arrange for him to be here. Unfortunately, we are in the middle of a very active period right now. As you all know, the second reading of the new Environment Act, which is an important development, went through early this week. Also, this is the period when the estimates are reviewed. Therefore this is an intense time which requires extensive preparation by the Minister himself. During the estimates review process he must be available to answer to his colleagues for all of his activities for the past year. If it were not impossible for him to get away, he would have liked to be here.

I would like to give you a quick update of four or five of the Environment Department's activities in the last year or so. The first one, in which many of us have been actively involved, is the Hazardous

Waste Crown Corporation. The Hazardous Waste Crown Corporation Act has been passed and a Chair and Board has been appointed. With his background both in government and environmental areas, Nick Carter is well qualified as Chair. And frankly, it's the best constituted board I've seen since I've been in the government. It's a widely representative board and I think it's going to work well. They're in the process now of identifying the chief executive officer. They will have office space two weeks from now. The most recent public hearings report will be made public by the Clean Environment Commission shortly. That will present a general roadmap and guidelines for the corporation.

The second area, in which we have spent less time in the last year but made much progress is on the issue of Acid Rain. Up until about 18 months ago, there were ongoing meetings between all the provinces and the federal government to hammer out the basis of where we're going. As you probably know, the Minister and the federal Minister signed an agreement which by 1994 will reduce emissions in the province from the present 738 to 550 kilotonnes per year. Basically, the process of emissions reductions has been in three phases: 1) to identify what the general reduction would be for Canada, 2) to apportion that reduction amongst the participating provinces; (that is largely complete), 3) to determine how that will be implemented on a point source basis. On 27 and 28 May and 4 June in Winnipeg, there are hearings on the SO_2 regulation which will address the emissions of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and INCO. We'll be controlling the emissions by way of regulations, as opposed to Clean Environment Commission order, because there is a national agreement which dictates the upper limits.

Environment Week is starting next week. If you haven't been invited to the opening ceremonies in Assiniboine Park, Sunday, I invite you to attend. It looks like it will be a lot of fun. I'm pleased to say that the activities this year are much broader than usual. Selkirk is putting on a full week's program. Neepawa has a project cleaning up a roadside park. The Churchill Northern Studies Centre has initiated some clean-up activities. The activities of the Week have spread quite widely and I hope next year it will spread even more.

Another development which we implemented a little over a year ago, is the pesticide permit registration. Two hundred and thirty-nine permits were given out last year. We anticipate about the same number this year. There still are concerns in this area. We simply don't have the pesticide toxicity data and other data that we do for other chemicals. We are working with the federal and other provincial Ministers of Environment and met three or four months ago with the Ministers of Agriculture and Health and Welfare to raise concerns we have about data and access to that data. There has been some movement over the past 18 months because of the Salter Report. We are attempting to get additional and more valid, particularly health-related data. There is a fundamental difficulty in as much as some pesticide data is not available anywhere in the world.

In the second reading of the Nuclear Waste Act we have prohibited the disposal or storage of high level nuclear wastes in the province. The Bill, however, will permit the experimental activities that are going on now to continue. The reaction has been quite interesting. Manitoba has been seen nationally as leading the way in terms of making a clear and unequivocal statement on the issue of nuclear waste storage.

I'd like to move on to the new Environment Act. We were trying to set in motion tougher and more organized approaches to environmental management. Late last fall or early spring, Cabinet adopted eight principles for environmental management. We are the first province to do so. We are trying to introduce five different concepts in the new Act. The first is a broadening of scope. The Clean Environment Act is basically a physical ecosystem Act. We had no real authority anywhere in our Act to deal with human values or soci-economic matters. We now have that. We didn't have the authority legally to do environmental impact assessments although they were done on provincial projects by policy. We now are one of the few governments that will assess both public and private sector projects. This doesn't mean that we did not get involved with major private sector projects, but we did it by way of policy rather than by legislation.

As you know, we had problems with the old Act because it was the original Act. It only required proponents or developers to register with the Commission and then they could go ahead and build whatever they wanted. That was looked upon as quite reasonable by the people who drafted the Act because in 1968, there were many emitters already in operation and it would have been unreasonable to say that they could not operate until they had a license or a Commission order when they were already operating. More recently, and Clearwater Lake is a classic example, we still have situations where we are holding hearings well after something has been built or is well along the way. Now, under the new Environment Act, developers must have a license before they operate. As well, we wanted to make the process of getting a license (order under the old system) more efficient and effective. We wanted to ensure that the routine technical aspects could be dealt with quickly so that we could spend more time and have more public involvement and more focus on the larger complex projects. The way our system is currently structured, we basically can spend as much time on a sewage lagoon as we will on a Limestone hydro project. Under the current Act there is no way to deal with the straight forward technical projects for which there are existing standards. We've built in checks and balances so that projects cannot be slipped in as routine when they are not. There is a public registry and public announcement process in the departmental review process for every project whether or not its one that's going to go quickly through the process or be a major one. It's open for public review and judgement.

The third area of concern has been that by and large, the environmental impact process has been separate from the emissions control process. From our point of view, basically we want to encourage development which is environmentally sensitive and has the correct controls on it. There's no point having one process to deal with emissions and another to deal with siting and socio-economic impact. It makes sense to have one license for all of those impacts. So we will have a single application, and a single license. There is a benefit to the developers in that they go to one contact point in government; there is also a benefit to the rest of us. We know that when the process starts on a development, it will consider all aspects of development and we won't have to follow several processes.

The fourth concern is the critical principle that public consultation and participation must be strengthened. I think our record in this regard in this province is as good as anywhere else but we felt it could be improved. So we've done that.

Finally, and not surprisingly, we've strenghtened the enforcement regulations. I'm not so concerned about the absolute numbers as about the other mechanisms which we now have. Under the old Act we couldn't prohibit the continuing operation of a pollutor. So a pollutor could, in some cases, although there are no examples in this province, if the cost of cleanup were several million dollars and the fine was a thousand dollars a day, choose to pay the fine. It was cheaper to pay the fine, both in the short and longer term and continue to operate than it was to spend the money to clean up. We have prevented that. We provide in our Act that the court can close an operation or a polluting part of an operation once a determination of violation has been made. Also, we've added another feature which I think will be interesting. We have given the courts the right in essence to tax away profits from pollution. In other words, an operator could get a $200,000 fine and if he made profits during that period by continuing pollution, those profits would be taken away in addition to the fine itself. We have taken away any possibility for continued profitability through some loophole that we may not be able to see. The Act is a framework. It doesn't provide the detail. But we have to cast the framework in such a way that the detail can be put in. We can't expand upon the Act after it is passed. We can define and refine by way of regulation and implement by way of regulation but we can't broaden the scope. I think that our enforcement provisions are broad enough to give us enough tools to do what has to be done, and I don't think the exact fines are as important as some of the other provisions.

There will be about six months between the time the Act is actually passed, sometime before mid-summer, and proclamation. This will provide time to work out the details, some of which are fairly straight forward. Most of the regulations under the existing Act will be rolled over. Under the new Act, any new regulations are legally required to go through a public consultation process. This is a feature of our Act which is unusual in provinces. This has been policy as long as I have been here. It has been an extremely effective process. Through the consultation process, we have written much better regulations. In some cases we've made substantial changes but in the end, we've been able to implement a set of regulations that work. We've never lost a critical concept in that process. In the public consultation process on the Discussion paper released in September, 1986, there were three principle areas in which we received comments. Where he thought the comments were reasonable, the Minister followed the suggestions. These areas are: public consultation, the Manitoba Environmental Council and Clean Environment Commission, and the question of the accountability of the Department and its bureaucrats, particularly the Director of the Environmental Management Divison. It appeared in the September, 1986 draft, that the Director had a great deal of arbitrary authority. The rationale for that was that routine technical matters are handled in other provinces at the Director level by licenses and it was our intention to do so here. But as a result of the comments, we limited the authority of both the Director and the Minister. I think we have the only act in the country that requires the Minister to give public reasons if he, after a public hearing process by the Commission does not accept the recommendations. Similarly, the Director is accountable. In terms of reducing the

arbitrary authority of the Director, we have divided types of licenses and assessments into three categories. Class One is purely technical-proposals involving one emission which can be handled basically with the expertise in our department. After making the proposal known publicly, putting the report in a public registry and after circulating it to a group of interested departments and to the interdepartmental planning board, the Director then will simply be able to issue a license.

If on the other hand there is a technical emission component, plus some other aspect the project will be considered a Class Two. This involves more public involvement and a more detailed review. In the end, the Director will issue the license.

The third category, includes projects like the Limestone Generating Station megaprojects. In Class three, the Minister directs the process. There is a public notification and a public summary placed in the regionally-based public registry across the province. The public is also notified through the press that such a project is going forward. It is inconceivable that a Class Three project would go ahead without a full public hearing process. The Minister is the one who issues the license.

Under the September, 1986 draft, it appeared as if the Environmental Commission, the replacement for MEC and CEC, reported to the Director and not to the Minister. That is not the case in the new Act. Both the MEC and the CEC will report directly to the Minister. Every decision of the Director is appealable to the Minister. You may find in your reading of the Act that it says in some places the Director "may". The reason the wording is "may" rather "shall" in all cases is that, had we made it "shall", there would be no discretion on the part of the Director. Therefore there would be no appeal for that clause in the Act. So in all cases where the Director makes a decision, even though it may be a straightforward decision, where we believe the public or proponent ought to have an appeal, the wording is "may".

There must be public reasons in all cases where the recommendations of a Commission hearing are rejected. In the new Act, we've placed criteria on many of the decisions, timeframes and have significantly tightened up the process so that the Director does not have the power which he seemed to have before. We have retained the basic principle that simple projects ought to be dealt with technically and quickly and with the public being kept informed.

MEC is now independent in law as well as in practice. Up until the Act is proclaimed, MEC could simply disappear and there isn't anything that anybody could do. We abandoned the notion of combining the strengths of MEC, which we see as very valuable, along with those of the Commission which we see as valuable but different. They are two independent bodies although there is a provision for at least one annual meeting. Personally, I am pleased that there is the clause that allows the Commission to add MEC members for specific hearing panels. I think that's a step forward. We'll be the only province with a mandatory State of the Environment report every two years. I think that's going to be extremely difficult but achievable.

I think the Act is a very progressive piece of legislation. The public registry is regionally-based, and very informative. All of the activities under the Act are appealable. One of the other features is environmental mediation. Often, problems can be worked out if the parties sit down

with a neutral party and state the problems. One other thing is that the City of Winnipeg is not exempt in any way, shape or form. I think with that general overview, I'll open it to questions.

COORDINATOR'S REPORT

Keri Barringer

ACTIVITY REPORT 1986/87 FISCAL YEAR

Major Activities of Council this past fiscal year were limited due to financial restrictions:

1) Monthly board meetings were held in Winnipeg, although out of town travel was restricted after the 1986 Annual Meeting.

2) Council prepared a brief to the CEC Hazardous Waste Hearings which was presented in 10 locations in Manitoba.

3) The New Environment Act was released in draft form and Council reviewed it and prepared a response for the Minister. MEC had representation at the information meetings held throughout the province and at the Environment Network public hearings on the Environment Act.

4) Most recently, Council has participated in the CEC hearings on Clearwater Lake Sewage Lagoon and the SO_2 Emission Standards for Manitoba.

5) One guest speaker this year - Mr. Dave Mackenzie, attended the Feb. 4th Board meeting and discussed the hazards of flouridation in drinking water.

6) The Annual Meeting and tomorrow's Public Forum on Energy and the Provincial Conservation Strategy were formalized.

7) The trip to Northern Manitoba and Churchill to discuss provincial conservation strategies has been finalized.

8) A planning meeting for developing a provincial conservation strategy for Manitoba, was held May 23rd, and has resulted in the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to review and develop this strategy.

REGIONAL REPORTS

INTERLAKE

Bill Aitken
Interlake Regional Chair

It is a privilege to share environmental concerns from the Interlake Region of Manitoba with Council. Residents living near the quarries near Stonewall have become vocal about excess noise levels due to operations that go on day and night; all year round. They have taken their complaint to the rural municipality (Rockwood) which claims to have no authority to act on the matter.
The red sided Garter snake, found throughout the central Interlake in world class numbers is threatened with extinction through over harvesting. Thanks to the concern of MEC and others, the situation is under study and protective measures expected.

Dogs running at large in ever increasing numbers are becoming a major threat to pedestrians; especially children. Wolves and bears are the scapegoats when livestock carcasses are found as the result of neighbourhood dogs travelling in fearless packs. Municipal governments are reluctant to enforce even minimum control on these pets of ratepayers, that when running at large not only are a danger, but also leave disgusting messes on public property.

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

NORTHERN REGION

Ed Johanson
Northern Regional Chair

During the late summer of 1986, along highway 287 in Clearwater Lake Provincial Park, and not far from Campers Cove Public Camp Grounds, it was noted clearing of forest from a large area was taking place. On closer investigation, it was determined that Parks Branch were preparing to locate and build a sewage lagoon for use by the public and to accomodate pump-out sewage from Campers Cove.

Many of the park users in and around the area became concerned because of the location of this lagoon and it's possible drainage into a small adjacent lake which drains into Clearwater Lake via Jackfish Creek.

This concern was brought to the attention of the Clean Environment Commission and a two day public hearing was held in the middle of April, 1987. A number of written submissions were presented to the Commission, as well as many verbal submissions. Public participation involved more than one hundred people each day.

The entire process had extensive radio and newspaper coverage and was eventually brought to the attention of the Legislature.

The Clean Environment Commission has placed an order on this Lagoon and further development has been placed on hold pending a better solution than the drainage of same into Clearwater Lake. Lagoons are needed for private pump-out but should not be located on the Clearwater Lake Watershed.

The expansion of the Public Camp Site at Campers Cove which is already in a high density area should not be encouraged. Hugo Bay should be further developed where there is under usage at this time. Adequate infrastructure is in place with adequate room for future expansion if so desired.

Mining exploration is continuing. Last winter saw drills were operating on the lake with extensive staking activity taking place. Drilling is affecting the quality of the lake, and claim-staking affecting the forest coverage. Both activities appear to have little concern for the environment. Forest harvest operations are continuing under Parks and Forestry Branch supervision. There are forested areas suffering from diseases that should be considered for harvest under close supervision of the responsible authority.
The tree nursery located in the park is developing as planned and is an effective measure in the reforestration program in conjunction with Manfor.

Plans are developing for a Manitoba Forestry Association site in the old Guy Hill school area adjacent to the Forest Nursery with the sod turning program taking place May 29, 1987. This will greatly enhance the education of our youth being easily accessible to the Cormorant Lake, Moose Lake, The Pas, The Pas Indian Band, Cranberry Portage, and Flin Flon schools as well as other organizations in the area.

The Resource Managers Course conducted through Keewatin Community College in The Pas is progressing well with graduates finding employment in various parts of Canada. The more qualified Resource Managers that can

be produced and can find employment in Northern Manitoba and Canada is a plus to our environmental challenges.

Our Northern area (two thirds of our Province) is far too vast and growing too fast for adequate representation to our Council. Representation together with adequate funding should be increased if we are to be effective prior to development, and not after the fact. The lagoon situation relative to Clearwater Lake is an ideal example. Were it not for the local concerned people taking action, it would have been cut, excavated, and in operation before history recognized it fully.

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

PEMBINA VALLEY REGION

Hugh Arklie
Pembina Valley Regional Chair

The Pembina Valley Region lies directly south of Winnipeg and includes the area approximately 50 miles north of the U.S. border. Major towns in the region include Morden, Winkler, Carman and Altona. It is primarily an agricultural area, and is quite prosperous in comparison to other agricultural areas on the Prairies.

My appointment to the MEC was made official in the fall of 1986, and my first task was to publicize that fact locally. Accordingly, announcements appeared in the local press and on local radio stations. The response was gratifying. Several people commented that they had noticed the announcements, and proceeded to be very supportive of the cause of environmental protection. Obviously, concern for the environment is no longer the private domain of hippies, socialists and professors - the person in the street is interested and is saying so.

Specific actions that were undertaken in my capacity as Pembina Valley Region representative include:

1. Presentation of the MEC brief at the Hazardous Waste Hearing held in Morden.

2. Responding to proposed legislation regarding the environment.

3. Supporting the Council of the Town of Morden with respect to its long term plans to restore the condition of Dead Horse Creek.

4. Offering assistance to a local group which is attempting to expedite the creation of a new provincial park to be known as the Pembina Valley Recreational Trailway.

It is difficult to avoid issues that concern the whole province, not just the Pembina Valley. In this regard I have dealt with concerns expressed to me including:

1. Water levels on the Lake of the Woods. Many cottage owners are Manitobans concerned about fluctuations in water levels that have apparently killed loons and muskrats. A representative of the Lake of the Woods Property Owners' Association asked me to raise their concerns with MEC.

2. In response to news items, I brought the issue of garter snake harvesting to the attention of the Wildlife Committee.

For the new year, my goals are to pursue the issue of garter snake harvesting and to investigate the following issues as they relate to the Pembina Valley specifically:

1. Destruction of shelter belts.
2. Drainage of farm land.
3. Discarding of chemical containers.
4. Recycling of soft drink and beer cans.

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

WESTERN REGION

Roger Smith
Western Regional Chair

Environmental issues of concern primarily to the citizens of western Manitoba continue to be low-key. This does not mean that citizens are unaware of, or uninterested in, environmental problems; rather, it means that the majority of concerns are those that affect the whole province, the country, or are of global significance. The general populace does exhibit anxiety about nuclear war, depletion of the ozone layer, the greenhouse effect, radioactive waste disposal, etc., but issues that are of more local concern are not particularly prevalent.

The following are the major, local matters of most relevance:

1. Hazardous Waste Hearing - The brief on behalf of the Manitoba Environmental Council was presented to the Clean Environment Commission Hearings in Brandon in late November, 1986. A number of other briefs dealing with hazardous waste were also presented to the Commission.

2. New Garbage Disposal Site (Virden) The disposal site presently used by the town of Virden has been declared unsafe as it is leaking into Gopher Creek. After examining alternatives, the town of Virden and the Municipality of Wallace decided to share a new disposal site.

Water Resources made a preliminary assessment of the proposed site and declared that, although it was underlain by glacial debris including pools of water, it did not pose a potential contamination threat to the aquifer. The Department of Workplace Safety and Health drilled in August, 1985, and again in October, 1986, following an assessment from Paddock Drilling Ltd. in January, 1986. The site was deemed to be secure in that contamination of the underlying aquifer as well as the nearby Assiniboine River were considered unlikely.
In early 1987, a group of concerned citizens suggested that the proposed site was unsafe and then proposed an alternate site. I spent several days investigating the matter and met with the citizens to say that I could not agree to recommending investigation of their alternative site on the grounds of potential water pollution. I could, however, agree that the proposed site does pose a potential fire hazard unless very stringent precautions are taken. Despite the fact that the issue had been brought to the attention of Minister Gerard Lecuyer, the citizens have decided to initiate court action.

I feel that the MEC has investigated these concerns and that no further action is warranted from us. The environmental aspects have been adequately assessed. It is possible that complaints may have a non-environmental basis.

3. Modification of Provincial Highway 340 - The Highways Department is considering widening PTH 340 from the Trans Canada Highway To Camp Shilo. This would involve removal of several curves in the town of Douglas and rebuilding the road through the marshes south of that town. The marshes are a recorded nesting site of the yellow rail (Coturnicops noveboracensis) and other marsh dwellers. The yellow rail is designated as "rare and extremely shy" and might be affected by both the construction itself and the drainage changes.

4. "Soils at Risk" - The problems of soil degradation as outlined in the booklet "Soils at Risk" seem to be becoming better realized by the agriculture community in western Manitoba. At present, no action by MEC appears warranted.

5. Anhydrous Ammonia Depot (Foxwarren) - No further communication has been received and the relevant government authorities are investigating the matter.

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

ENERGY COMMITTEE

Martin Egan

The Energy Committee was relatively inactive during the 1986/87 season; however, a variety of activities were undertaken and these included:

1. Participation on MEC subcommittee to review and respond to the Discussion Bill of the proposed provincial environmental legislation;

2. Submission of an article outlining the MEC sub-committee's view on the proposed environmental legislation, for publication in the Environmental Law Centre Newsletter (Vol.4, No.4);

3. Review of the draft Manitoba Surface Water Quality Objectives prepared by the Water Standards and Studies Section of the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety & Health;

4. Ongoing liaison with the Transmission and Stations Engineering Section of Manitoba Hydro regarding route selection and station siting for a 230 KV transmission line from Croner to Virden in southwestern Manitoba;

5. Preparation of a brief to the Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health regarding snow dumping practices in the City of Winnipeg;

6. Review of the Manitoba Hydro consultants environmental overview study for the Conawapa and associated transmission lines project.

Issues to be addressed by the Energy Committee during the 1987/88 season will include future hydro-electric development in northern Manitoba with specific focus on the proposed Winokwetin and Conawapa Generating Stations, one of which will likely be the next station constructed by Manitoba Hydro. Additionally, the committee will explore superconductors and various state-of-the-art alternative energy sources. The apparent waning of public energy conservation consciousness, fuelled in part by the continuing world oil glut and the recent imposition of tax on energy-saving insulation materials by various levels of government, may also merit consideration by the committee.

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

WILDLIFE COMMITTEE

Dr. James B. Nickels

The Wildlife Committee scheduled its meetings for the evening before the Board meets, so that rural members could conveniently attend both meetings. Almost all Committee

members attended every meeting. In addition, guests and visiting speakers attended one or more meetings.

The Wildlife Committee directed its attention to many issues and problems during the year. Continuing concerns included long-term ecological studies on the Polar Bear and the problem for these animals considering hydrocarbon development in Hudson's Bay. Another continuing concern was the status of Indian Treaty Hunting Rights based on the 1985 decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. The Committee sought legal opinion from several sources regarding this latter issue. Another "holdover" from the previous year was the concern over the possible effects of MEC reorganization on the Wildlife Committee. Finally, the Committee kept up its vigilance about several issues relating to Manitoba wildlife, including problems of hunting and trapping, parks and park development, threatened wildlife and wildlife habitat, and intrusive roads and other means of access through wilderness areas.

New issues were also examined by the Wildlife Committee. Proposals were advanced regarding the World Conservation Strategy. The Committee sought and obtained information and clarification on the Caribou Management Board Agreement. The Committee investigated current concerns about animal rights, animal rights groups, research on animals and the consumptive use of animals. Related to this investigation were efforts to help injured wildlife through the Manitoba Wildlife Rehabilitation Organization (Winnipeg) and to evaluate the wisdom of continued capture and sale of Manitoba snakes (especially garter snakes) for research purposes. Another matter examined by the Committee was wildlife ranching. In fact, the Committee made a strong case against elk ranching in the Province.

Finally, the Wildlife Committee acted as the reviewer of two papers to be published through MEC. The first involved the manuscript based on the Public Forum (March 2-3, 1984) entitled "Manitoba Wildlife into the 21st Century." The second paper was written by a summer student on wildlife and wildlife habitat in Manitoba.

I would like to thank the members of the Wildlife Committee for their interest in and efforts to protect and enhance wildlife and wildlife habitat in Manitoba. As volunteers in a worthy cause they deserve the appreciation of all Manitobans.

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Dr. Basil Rotoff

The Activities of the Environmental Impact Review Committee have been somewhat subdued due to the small size of the Committee and some health problems the Chair of this committee has suffered.

Most of the activities centered around the planning and organizing of the Forum on Power Demand. The Committee has directed work by two graduate students. A student in City Planning completed a study on Snow Dumping which formed the basis of a brief presented at the meeting. A student in landscape architecture is in the process of completing a study on environmental impact of highway constructions near Shoal Lake in the Interlake; a report will be submitted shortly.

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

BRIEFS

1. PROTECTION OF DRINKING WATER SOURCES IN MANITOBA

Recommendations:

The Council recommends to the Minister that the Government of Manitoba adopt unified safe drinking water legislation and that such legislation should:

1. Recognize the priority of water use for drinking over all other human uses;

2. Emphasize protection of drinking water sources from contamination rather than the treatment of contaminated water;

3. Accept the "Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water" as a minimal standard and develop stricter standards for Manitoba;

4. Require environmental assessment and regulation of all commercial activities in the watershed, including mining, logging, agriculture, recreation and hydro-electric development;

5. Restrict public access to the water source and to a buffer zone around it and exclude from the buffer zones those activities (e.g. waterfowl hunting, cottage development, garbage disposal, snow disposal) and industries (e.g. mining, logging) that are major sources of pollutants;

6. Provide mechanisms for monitoring all municipal drinking water sources by an impartial agency;

7. Provide a mechanism for resolving problems involving federal and inter-provincial jurisdictions;

8. Recognize the following sources of water contamination and provide mechanisms to prevent or minimize their effects on the water:

   (a) Pesticides from run off, spray, drift and aerial deposition;

   (b) dust-control chemicals on roads;

   (c) winter roads over the ice;

   (d) paint, solvents, preservatives, tars and thinners applied to locks and buildings near the water;

   (e) airborne pollutants from industrial and incineration sources and vehicle exhaust from internal combustion engines;

   (f) destruction of aquatic vegetation in the water source by boats, harvesting or aquatic herbicides;

   (g) fluctuations in water levels due to damming and manipulations;

   (h) accidents involving chemicals carried by road or rail;

   (i) jettisoning of fuel by aircraft;

Background:

This brief was developed to express in a more comprehensive manner the concerns about drinking water that were presented in a previous brief to the Minister (MEC Annual Report 1986, pp. 28-29).

At present, legislation concerning the protection of drinking water in Manitoba is inadequate. There is increasing pressure on our water resources as well as a proliferation of activities which may adversely affect water quality. Deterioration of water quality often represents an irretrievable and irreversible loss, which may lead to expensive projects

to provide other sources or to purify the water. At present, it is the responsibility of each province to enact a Safe Drinking Water Act or appropriate similar legislation, or no legislation if the province so chooses. Manitoba does not have suitable legislation to protect water bodies that are used as drinking water sources. Competing activities may pose potential hazards to health and destroy the future viability of the water body as a drinking water source. A unified safe drinking water act is needed to ensure that such activities do not impact on the quality of the water as a drinking water source.

The inadequacies of the existing system are responsible for numerous contaminated and threatened drinking water sources in Manitoba. Among them are the following typical cases:

* Indian Bay of Shoal Lake

  Winnipeg's water source, Indian Bay, has been threatened since 1979 by a massive development consisting of approximately 350 cottage lots, 80 condominium units, mink farms and associated high-density commercial facilities. Even now, Indian Bay is contaminated by garbage, heavy metals, pesticides, emissions from winter roads, and sewage; no system is in place to prevent this, even though the quality of this water source directly affects the health of more than 600,000 people. For example, colliform counts of untreated Indian Bay water may at times exceed 500 MPN, indicating grossly contaminated water. This necessitates more intensive chlorination; the chlorine combines with natural dissolved organic materials in the water to produce carcinogenic chloroform. Lead levels in Shoal Lake may exceed 1lug/l; this is excessive for a Shield type lake. Arsenic levels have also risen as a result of mining activities in Shoal Lake.

* Clearwater Lake

  The Parks Branch has proposed the operation of a sewage lagoon in Clearwater Lake Provincial Park which would eventually discharge into Clearwater Lake, which is being considered as a water supply source for The Pas. Incredibly, 350 cottage owners already occupy the shore of this lake.

* Whitemud River

  The community of Gladstone has experienced contamination of its water source from blood and sewage dumping by a massive hog slaughtering operation upstream.

* Red River

  The town of Selkirk has had to cope with grossly contaminated water from dumping upstream. For example, colliform levels as high as 70,000 MPN are present in this water; the acceptable level (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) for drinking water is 4 MPN.

* Boyne River

  The town of Carman has experienced deteriorating water quality as a result of shoreline run-off from developments along the Boyne River, which is not a river in

the regular sense, but a closed water body. Nitrogen and phosphorus levels have risen greatly in this water body.

* Jackson Lake

The water source of the town of Sidney has been polluted by recreational activity on Jackson Lake including the proliferation of cottages on the shoreline. Nitrogen and phosphorus have increased dramatically in the lake during the last 15 years.

* Rice Lake

The town of Bissett has experienced contamination of its lake by recreational use and dumping of mine tailings. This lake has become nutrient-rich and has become subject to noxious algal blooms. Arsenic and metal contamination have also increased.

* Lake Manitoba

Communities along the southern shoreline of Lake Manitoba have experienced severe declines in water quality as a result of sewage effluent from cottages and input of agricultural run-off via the Portage Diversion Channel.

* Lake Winnipeg

Communities along the South Basin of Lake Winnipeg have experienced declines in water quality as a result of improper sewage handling and increased recreational pressure. This has resulted in problem algal blooms during the summer, increased turbidity and periodic fish kills due to oxygen depletion.

* Elie Aquifer

The Elie Aquifer has been contaminated by the herbicide bromoxynil. The contamination originated from surface run-off from agricultural lands. The run-offs flooded a quarry north of the town in June, 1984. Eighteen months after the flooding, bromoxynil was still detectable in water from the aquifer underneath the quarry, which serves as the town's water supply. Thus a herbicide which is known to be unstable in surface waters and which degrades rapidly in agricultural soils, breaks down much more slowly in subsurface ground waters. Rural aquifers may remain contaminated for much longer than would be predicted by surface models. Proposals to recharge aquifers with surface water risk permanently contaminating ground waters with pesticides.

The basic principal for safe drinking water legislation should be the priority of this use over all other uses. At present, use of water bodies as municipal water supply sources in Manitoba is permitted to overlap with recreation, mining, logging, agriculture, construction of winter roads, commercial fishing and other activities approved by various government departments. A unified Safe Drinking Water Act is needed to ensure that such activities do not impact on the quality of the water as a drinking water source. Any proposed projects which would affect a drinking water source should be subject to a mandatory environmental review process.

As well as giving priority to drinking water usage, legislation should focus on protection of existing water sources, rather than allowing them to

be damaged by other activities, and then require treatment to remove the contaminants. In the long run, protection will be much less expensive than treatment. The development of Guidelines for Drinking Water in Manitoba should also be required in the legislation. The Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water (1978) are not adequate as a standard because:

(a) They provide standards for only a few inorganic water quality parameters, while many others of equal or greater importance to health are ignored; furthermore, a great many industrial organic chemicals are ignored, as are many pesticides and herbicides which are injurious to health.

(b) They provide maximum values considered acceptable that are often higher than comparable maximum standards set out by the EPA.

(c) The maximums provided are often outdated and grossly inflated; they may greatly exceed the levels present in water sources of exceptional quality, thus encouraging the deterioration of such water sources up to the acceptable maximum levels;

(d) They ignore the synergism of several parameters acting together (e.g. chloride and sulphate).

Reference:

Dr. Eva Pip - Annual Report 14, 1986 p.40-44.

Presented by the Environmental Impact Assessment Committee, May 29, 1987.

2. SNOW DUMPING PRACTICES IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Recommendations:

The Manitoba Environmental Council recommends to the Minister that snow dumping practices in the City of Winnipeg be reviewed by the Department of Environment with the objective of adopting appropriate regulations that will endure environmentally acceptable stockpiling of this waste product.

Background:

Recent studies (Scott and Wylie, 1980; Lockery, 1983) have concluded that snow removed from city streets contains significant concentrations of calcium chloride, lead, oils and grease, residues from tires, suspended solids, soils and sand, and assorted trash. To date, there are no regulations governing the practice of dumping snow. In Winnipeg, river banks are typically used to stockpile the snow until spring when the run-off flows untreated directly into the river: the large stockpile of snow often constricting the flow of the stream, causing bank erosion. The environmental impact of such run-off on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers are not well known and therefore should be assessed.

References:

Hambley, R., The Environmental Impacts of Urban Snow Dumping. Term paper, University of Manitoba, Depts. of City Planning and Landscape Architecture, 1987.
Scott, W. S. and Wylie, N. P., Snow Dumping: A Literature Review. Journal of Environmental Management, 1980, Vol. 10, No. 218. Lockery, A., Unpublished study, University of Winnipeg, Dept. of Geography, 1983.

Presented by the Environmental Impact Assessment Committee, May 29, 1987.

3. NEW ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION FOR THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

We welcome the opportunity to present views of members of the MEC at this hearing. In a letter to the Minister of Environment dated November 26, 1986, the MEC recommended that the government hold public hearings on this proposed legislation. Although

the government has held several information sessions and has met privately with groups and individuals, including the MEC, it has opted to not hold public hearings. We welcome this opportunity to share with other groups and individuals advice to the government to help ensure that the environmental legislation once passed will function well.

The MEC commends the Minister and his Department for drafting much-needed legislation in the field of environment which encompasses "developments" in addition to "pollution". We also commend the Minister for releasing the legislation in draft form and providing several months for the public to study and provide advice on it. The fact that several groups have called for public hearings and that this group has organized today's hearings indicates the depth of interest in, and the seriousness with which groups and individuals take this legislation. We urge the government to consider carefully the feedback from the public. Almost all feedback I have seen indicates serious reservations with a number of important aspects of the legislation.

A few words to describe the MEC before I indicate our feedback. The Environmental Council was begun in 1972 as an advisory body to the Minister responsible for Environment. It identifies, collects and presents information on environmental problems, discusses environmental priorities, and transmits the results of its activities to the Minister and the public. The Environmental Council is composed of 100 members, 55 individuals plus 45 members who represent non-profit organizations in Manitoba. Some of these organizations are themselves federations. The grass roots base of the Council is thus large. These organizations have an input into the positions adopted by the Council; they are kept informed as environmental issues emerge. The Council represents a good deal of Manitoba's technical expertise in environmental fields, consisting of 22 members with PhD's, MD's or law degrees. It represents all walks of life and many interest areas, including forestry, mining, agriculture, naturalists, and wildlife groups. Members bring concerns from the 8 regions and 22 cities and towns in which they reside.

One of the primary concerns I have is concrete evidence of the determination of the government to enforce this new legislation in its full scope and potential. In his letter in March, 1987, Manitoba's Premier Howard Pawley mentions that the new act will provide for higher standards, tougher penalties and increased public involvement. He did not mention more funding for the Department of Environment to carry out this mandate. By nature of its inclusion of developments, the Act will impinge on the jurisdictions of other departments; Natural Resources, Agriculture, Highways, Health and Welfare and crown corporations such as Manitoba Hydro. The public should be informed about how departments and agencies will cooperate with environment in major developments - hydro-electric developments, hydro rights-of-way, highways, forestry leases, water diversions and so on. Our environment is influenced by many departments of government and by the industries and activities regulated by many departments. Environment is a government-wide issue. Is the government behind the new legislation? Let's see the evidence.

The proposed legislation intends (Principle No. 5, p. 14) to strengthen enforcement. Indeed it does an excellent job of increasing the penalties not only by increasing fines but also by providing for conviction of officers of corporations. Stiffer penalties may have a deterrent effect. Enforcement in terms of

convictions is exceedingly low, since only a couple of convictions have been made under the Clean Environment Act. However, clearly, increasing the penalties will not increase convictions since penalties are only a part of enforcement. More environmental officers, properly trained in gathering evidence that will stand up in court, and more prosecutions could lead to stronger enforcement.

The legislation should incorporate an overall purpose, policy or guiding principles. The basis upon which go/no go decisions are made should be described. There is enormous responsibility and power concentrated in the position of the Director of the Environmental Management Division. These powers should be more limited or guided by widely-accepted policies.

The environmental impact assessment process needs to be defined much more clearly. We suggest that the exemptions in the act be removed. The process should be flexible enough to be able to handle emergency projects. All projects should be registered in the central registry so that the public as well as other government departments, including federal, have the opportunity to determine if there is an environmental impact.

One of the goals of the legislation is to strengthen public consultation and participation. To improve this aspect over what we have in the Clean Environment Act and the present situation, considerable rethinking of the legislation is necessary. Presently, public hearings can be precipitated by a "complaint by any person" (Clean Environment Act, 14 (6)). In the new legislation, public hearings would be called by the director or can be initiated by the Manitoba Environmental Commission. By what means can a member of the public have a hearing called?

With the greater scope of the proposed legislation, more projects can come before public hearings than previously. However, unless the public rights with regard to hearings are sufficient or clearly defined, there may actually be fewer public hearings than previously. No report of any hearings of public inquiry, according to the draft, is required to be made public.

Presently, briefs at public hearings held by the Clean Environment Commission are directed to the people making the order. How will the government provide this direct link under the new legislation? Clearly, if the public participation goal is to be taken seriously, the legislation must outline more clearly the meaningful avenues of public input.

The department may have benefitted in the drafting stages from discussion with its two arms, the Clean Environment Commission and the MEC, which interact directly with or represent the public. Loss of one public avenue of participation is central to the MEC's objection to its elimination. The proposed legislation would weaken public participation by removing a concrete, environmentally and socially-broad, educated vehicle for formulation and articulating citizens' concerns and views on environmental matters.

The members of the Environmental Council volunteer their time and receive no monetary compensation for their efforts (members expenses for out-of-town travel are reimbursed). This volunteerism brings three highly significant features to advice on Manitoban environmental matters. The first, personal energy and commitment, and the second, expertise, supplement those provided by government employees. The third feature is unique - an independent citizens' viewpoint with its own priorities and time frame. It is particularly this

third feature which would be lost by closing down the Environmental Council. The capacity to take positions on issues independently of immediate government priorities has meant through the years that the Environmental Council has strongly supported numerous government positions (the Hazardous Waste Management Program; its opposition to the location of underground nuclear waste repositories in the Red River basin in Minnesota; its declaration of a 100 m buffer zone around homes of citizens who object to fogging for nuisance mosquitoes; the establishment of parks and wilderness areas in the province). It has urged actions in advance of government action (environmental impact assessment legislation: Reduction in sulfur dioxide emissions by smelters, and, we anticipate, progress in the area of safe drinking water legislation). When necessary, the Environmental Council has vigorously opposed government decisions (to permit logging in Atikaki Provincial Wilderness Park) or urged the government not to take action until proper studies are completed and all alternatives are fully and publicly examined (the diversion of the Churchill River into the Nelson and the flooding of Southern Indian Lake).

The new Environmental Commission would be chaired by a full-time government employee. The Environmental Commission as described in the draft bill would be an arm of government and not a citizens' advisory body as is the present Environmental Council. Direct representation by fifty volunteer organizations on environmental matters would be lost.

Presently, the Clean Environment Commission and the MEC are functioning distinct bodies. The CEC is semi-judicial and the public hearing holding arm of the department. The MEC presents representative, environmentally-oriented regional views to that body at its hearings.

Even if the order-making function is removed from the CEC, the two functions of listening at public hearings, mediating disputes, sifting diverse public opinion is quite separate from the MEC's role of researching environmental matters, developing a representative citizen's viewpoint and articulating that opinion or recommendation. The Council recommends maintaining the MEC in the legislation as well as a public hearing body.

In conclusion, we support this important effort on the part of the Department of Environment and support the five goals. It is clear that if it is the intention of the government to progress toward these, considerable changes in the proposed legislation are necessary. Furthermore, it is clear that government-wide support and increased funding are necessary.

Presented by Dr. Diane F. Malley, Chair of the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

4. **PARKS BRANCH, SEWAGE LAGOON, CLEARWATER LAKE PROVINCIAL PARK**

The plan to proceed with this project was brought to the attention of the MEC by several organizations from The Pas as well as our representative for this area. The proposal was discussed by the Environmental Chemicals/Water & Waste Committee with the following results:

1. Additional facilities for campers, including a sewage lagoon to service these facilities, are needed at this Provincial Park.

2. Clearwater Lake requires a high level of protection from all contaminants, including nutrients, because:

   a) The exceptional clarity and purity of the water are a major reason for having the park at this lake rather than other northern lakes;

b) The watershed of this lake is small, (no large rivers or streams enter it) so water turnover is slow and any contaminants entering the lake would persist;

c) Clearwater Lake has been identified as a source of drinking water for The Pas in the future.

The MEC concludes that any discharge of contaminants into Clearwater Lake is unacceptable because:

1. High quality drinking water is the most valuable commodity in the world and should have priority over all other uses.

2. The high water quality of Clearwater Lake is its major attraction for tourist use and any reduction in its purity would reduce the attraction of the Park.

We, therefore, recommend that the Clean Environment Commission reject the application of Parks Branch to discharge sewage effluent into Clearwater Lake or any portion of its watershed. Other solutions to providing service facilities for campers should be adopted in which the effluent is discharged into the Saskatchewan River watershed because the water quality of this river is already lower than that of Clearwater Lake. If moving the lagoon and effluent discharge to another watershed from the currently proposed campsite is impractical, another location for the campsite should be selected.

Adopted by the Board of Directors, April 8, 1987.

5. SMELTER STACK EMISSION REGULATION

Recommendations:

The Manitoba Environmental Council agrees in principal with the draft Manitoba Regulation Respecting Atmospheric Emissions from Inco Limited in Thompson and Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co., Limited, in Flin Flon. The Committee recognizes that the federal government and provinces have agreed to formulas to distribute total reductions in SO_2 emissions in Canada among Manitoba and the provinces east of it. For example, Manitoba will reduce its emissions by 27%, Quebec by 45%, Ontario by 62% and New Brunswick by 14% by 1994 (House of Commons, 1987). These smelter stack emission regulations will accomplish the agreed-upon reductions in SO_2 emissions for Manitoba by 1994.

In addition to these emission regulations, however, this Committee urges that the Regulations include deposition standards. There are two reasons for this recommendation:

1. A regulation controlling deposition is the most direct and effective way of protecting Manitoba from acidification. This protection is the most important purpose of the Regulation. A deposition standard will take into account acidic deposition in Manitoba irregardless of whether or not the emissions originated in Manitoba.

2. The provinces west of Manitoba are not involved in this emissions reduction exercise. As the Manitoba Department of Environment and Workplace Safety & Health's brief (1987) states: "Manitoba is also downwind from emission sources in Western Canada and, therefore, we could be a receptor of acid rain". A clear regulation in place in Manitoba would strongly encourage, if not require, developments in Western Canada to model the quantities of sulfates their operation would produce and to design their

operations so that Manitoba's deposition standard would not be exceeded. Clearly, this is a preventative strategy for Manitoba and will be far more efficient for western province industries than adding controls after developments are in place.

We recommend that a deposition standard of 10 kg wet sulfate/ha/year be incorporated into the Manitoba Regulation. As the Department of Environment's brief states: "To protect all surface waters, wet sulfate deposition should not exceed 10 kg/ha/year". Deposition standards are becoming common in states of the United States. A landmark case is that of Minnesota which has adopted a deposition standard of 11 kg wet sulfate/ha/year (State of Minnesota, 1986).

There are several requirements associated with the deposition standard. One is through deposition monitoring. We recommend that in addition to the existing precipitation monitoring stations in Manitoba two or three additional ones be put into place in the northern part of the province. The second requirement is effective modelling of emission sources. We believe the capability for computer-modelling the deposition in Manitoba which results from emissions in provinces and states outside of Manitoba as well as the deposition resulting from Manitoba's emissions exists in the Department of Environment, Atmospheric and Environment Service, Toronto. Thus, the technology exists for implementing a deposition wet sulfate standard in Manitoba in addition to the emission standards as already drafted.

References:

House of Commons, 1987. Minutes of proceeding and evidence of the Special Committee on Acid Rain respecting acid rain abatement program: Status of federal-provincial agreements. House of Commons, Issue No. 10, Thursday, April 2, 1987.

Manitoba Department of Environment and Workplace Safety & Health, Environmental Control Programs, 1987. Presentation to the Clean Environment Commission on the Proposed Regulation respecting Atmospheric Emissions from Inco Limited, Thompson and Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co., Limited, Flin Flon.

State of Minnesota, Office of Administrative Hearings for the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 1986. Report of the Administrative Law Judge in the Matter of the Proposed Adoption of Minnesota Rules, Parts 7005.4010-7005.4050, relating to an Acid Deposition Standard and Control Plan, June 27, 1986.

6. LARVICIDING OF MOSQUITOES

In response to information that the City of Winnipeg proposes to increase the area surrounding the city that will be monitored for mosquito larvae and treated with larvicides, the committee was asked to propose a policy for use by MEC. Marc Trottier, in communication with Dr. R. Brust, Dept. of Entomology, University of Manitoba, provided the information on which the following proposed policy is based.

Considerations:

1. Currently the brood-spectrum chemical insecticides dursban, methoxychlor and malathion are the major products used by the city for larviciding. They are applied from helicopter or with ground equipment following larval surveys to identify ponds in need of treatment. These insecticides give fairly reliable control and persistance for the target

pests but also kill most other species of insects, including parasites and predators of mosquitoes.

2. Bacillus thuringiensis israeli (B.t.i.)
the biological insecticide developed for use against biting flies, has also been used in Winnipeg. This insecticide is toxic to target mosquitoes and black flies, but is not toxic to vertebrates or to other insects with the exception of some other species of flies (midges). Other compounds used in the B.t.i. formulation have not been recorded to exhibit any detrimental effect to living organisms. This insecticide also gives reliable control but it is less persistent than the chemical insecticides. Re-infestation of treated bodies of water may therefore occur more quickly than following the use of chemical insecticides and therefore more frequent larval surveys are needed.

3. The current emphasis on chemical larvicides is based on cost. B.t.i. is more expensive than the chemicals and, if used, there is an additional expense for more frequent larval surveys. However, there may be a hidden cost in the use of the chemicals: The need for heavier use of insecticides because the chemicals have destroyed the predators and parasites of mosquitoes which may exert some control over pest populations.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that MEC support the use of B.t.i. for use by the mosquito larviciding program of the City of Winnipeg and other jurisdictions in Manitoba. The additional costs associated with the use of B.t.i. can be justified by the reduction in the impact of non-target organisms and environmental contamination in general.

7. MONITORING FOR THE PRESENCE OF WESTERN EQUINE ENCEPHALITIS (WEE) ANTIBODIES IN BIRDS

We were informed that the Province of Manitoba has decided to monitor the occurrence of WEE antibodies in wild birds (house sparrows and blackbirds) rather than in sentinel flocks of chickens because of the high cost of the latter approach, and asked to propose a policy on WEE monitoring for the MEC. Marc Trottier obtained the information from Dr. R. Brust, Dept. of Entomology, University of Manitoba, on which the following proposal is based.

Considerations:

1. For many years, the Province of Manitoba monitored the occurrence of WEE antibodies in sentinel flocks of chickens. During the 1975 outbreak of WEE, an effective warning system (20 nights throughout the province, 10 birds per/site, sampled bi-weekly) was run by one person in cooperation with blood clinics. During the last year in which sentinel flocks were used (1983) at least five persons with vehicles were used to run the program.

2. The objective of this program was to provide early warning of WEE outbreaks. Criteria for evaluating changes in

antibody presence in sentinel flocks of chickens in Manitoba were well established on the basis of many years of experience at low and outbreak levels of WEE. Even if no aerial spraying to kill mosquitoes is planned, the early warning is useful to warn the populace to use personal protection measures (e.g. clothing, repellents).

3. Sampling of wild birds for WEE antibodies is used by Ontario and some states in the eastern U.S.A., where criteria for evaluating the results have been established.

4. The monitoring of WEE antibodies in wild birds in Manitoba began in 1984. During the last 2 years, the program has been run by a summer student who captures and samples 100 to 200 birds per summer. Good data on changes in antibody presence in wild birds would require the sampling of 100 birds per week.

5. The objective of this program is to gather baseline data on the relationship between the occurrence of WEE antibodies in wild birds and the incidence of WEE in horses and man. A secondary objective is to investigate the possible movement of the virus into Manitoba with migrating birds. The province is aware that this program does not provide an early warning system for WEE outbreaks.

6. There are no criteria for evaluating data on WEE antibodies in wild birds in Manitoba because the system has not been used for enough years to include data on years of WEE outbreaks.

Recommendations:

1. That the province re-establish the sampling of chicken flocks to provide an early warning of WEE outbreaks. A reduced program, similar to that operated in 1975, should be considered.

2. That the sampling of wild birds be continued to obtain the data necessary to use this system to provide an early warning of WEE outbreaks. The frequency of sampling should be increased to a weekly basis and 100 birds should be sampled on each occasion.

3. When sufficient data is available to establish criteria for evaluating the occurrence of antibodies in wild birds, the effectiveness and cost of the sentinel flock and wild bird approaches for predicting WEE outbreaks should be evaluated and a decision made as to which approach should be continued.

Bill Turnock, Environmental Chemicals
Water and Waste Committee Chair

RESPONSES TO BRIEFS

Dr. Atish Maniar

As the past Chair, it is my privilege to report about the Minister's responses to briefs submitted to the Hon. Gerard Lecuyer, Minister responsible for Environment, Workplace Safety & Health.

It is encouraging to note, that our briefs and recommendations submitted to the Minister are not falling on deaf ears. Our briefs are acknowledged with appreciation and responses are received in a positive tone.

The following seven briefs were submitted in May, 1986. Three briefs were from the Wildlife Committee, two from Environmental Chemicals/Water & Waste Committee and two were from the Environmental Impact Assessment Committee.

1. Hecla Island Provincial Park; Wildlife Committee.

2. HydroCarbon Development in Hudson Bay; Wildlife Committee.

3. Long - Term Ecological Studies on the Polar Bear; Wildlife Committee.

4. Safe Drinking Water Legislation; Environmental Chemicals/Water & Waste Committee

5. Asbestos in Drinking Water; Environmental Chemicals/Water & Waste Committee

6. Development of a Long Term Provincial Water Policy; Environmental Impact and Assessment Committee

7. Environmental Impact Study for the Conawapa Generating Station; Environmental Impact & Assessment Committee

In acknowledging the receipt of the above seven briefs, Hon. Gerard Lecuyer responded very favourably. In principle, he agreed with us sympathetically and forwarded some briefs to the Hon. Leonard Harapiak, Minister responsible for the provincial Department of Natural Resources.

I am pleased to submit the comments made by Hon. Harapiak as follows:

1. Hecla Draft Management Plan

   The draft plan indicates that hunting for moose would continue to be permitted on the outer islands of Hecla Provincial Park, but the matter of hunting on Hecla itself was debated at length during public meetings to review the draft plan.

   At this point in time, the Minister would not be prepared to consider closure of the entire park to hunting, but is carefully considering the Hecla Island situation and will bring recommendations to Cabinet when the Hecla Management Plan is presented.

   Expanded wildlife studies on the outer islands is a desirable goal and will be pursued as funds permit.

   No major new trail systems or developments such as mining or hydro are anticipated. Zoning proposed in the draft plan is intended to protect key wildlife habitats.

   Wildlife is a significant part of the natural heritage that Hecla is to represent and preserve. The Department will endeavour to proceed with care and sensitivity in any project that could affect wildlife in Hecla Provincial Park.

2. Sport and Subsistence Hunting

   Priority use of wildlife in Hecla Park should be for interpretive purposes. Hunting seasons at present occur during times when other use activities in the park are at low levels. Approximately one half of the island is off limits to hunters at present and we cannot foresee any conflict between different types of users.

3. Wildlife Studies

The Department has a substantial amount of information regarding other wildlife species on the other islands situated in this "archipelago", as well as on Grindstone Point. Presently, Parks Branch and Wildlife Branch are cooperatively augmenting and updating this data through a wildlife resource inventory to which a student has been assigned.

4. Proposed Development

The assorted development activities, if proposed, will be carefully scrutinized to ensure that disruption of wildlife and its habitat is minimized.

5. Temporary access roads rendered impassable

This is an excellent suggestion and will be considered for implementation.

6. Hydrocarbon Development in Hudson Bay

We agree with this recommendation.

7. Ecological Studies on the Polar Bear

Long term ecological studies related to reproductive biology, population dynamics, and human-bear interaction have been conducted in Northern Manitoba by research scientists from the Canadian Wildlife Service and the N.W.T. government since the early 1970's. This long term research program has been supported by the Manitoba Wildlife Branch with program coordination through Biological Services and the Federal-Provincial Polar Bear Technical Committee. Currently, Mr. A. Derocher is completing his graduate studies on the population ecology of bears along the Manitoba coastline.

* * *

Hon. Harry Harapiak, Minister of Northern Affairs, replied on January 5, 1987, that the government has decided not to allow commercial elk ranching; and the sale of elk meat and antler velvet in the Province of Manitoba.

The government also rescinded their previous decision on extraction and harvesting activities in Atikaki Provincial Wilderness Park. Two briefs regarding preserving the park were submitted to the Minister in 1986.

We have not received as yet responses on the briefs related to asbestos in drinking water, safe drinking water legislation, and development of a long-term Provincial Water Policy.

I would like to comment that briefs submitted for the year 1985-86 were greatly improved in quality as well as the statement of facts.

Presented at May 29, 1987 Council Annual Meeting

PUBLICATIONS

Herold L. Driedger

Contrary to the ambitious expectations indicated in last year's report, although much work was done by the co-editors, Herold Driedger and Jayesh Maniar, not many publications are forth-coming. The budget restraints forced upon us this past fiscal year affected all aspects of Council's work, including publications.

The co-editors adopted the philosophy that MEC should be ready to publish its backlog of papers as soon as appropriate means were found and worked towards that end. As of today, only one project, that of the Forestry Symposium held in December of 1985, has not yet been edited.

Publications Backlog:

1. Manitoba Provincial Parks: A Model for Wildlife Management

2. Potential Sources of Groundwater Contamination in Manitoba

   These two research projects, which were assigned to MEC's STEP students in 1984, 85 & 86 have been reworked and now need to be evaluated by appropriate committees of Council.

3. Environmental Practices and Manitoba Hydro

   Will be released shortly in xeroxed format with spiral binding as Topics 5.

4. Manitoba Wildlife into the 21st Century

   The results of this symposium are now in final word processing, awaiting the go ahead for publications as Topics 6.

5. Forestry in Manitoba: Habitat or Crops - Can we have it all?

   The first editing of this forum will be assigned to this summer's STEP student, and should make the work of the Publications Committee much easier.

No new publications are being contemplated except for the 1987 Annual Report.

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Council Meeting.

PUBLICATIONS LIST

The following is a list of MEC publications, several of which are now out of print but available in xeroxed copy from the Council Office.

Annual Reports:

1: 1973 (32 pp)
2: 1974 (74 pp)
3: 1975 (54 pp)
4: 1976 (79 pp)
5: 1977 (80 pp)
6: 1978 (87 pp)
7: 1979 (148 pp)
8: 1980 (101 pp)
9: 1981 (88 pp)
10: 1982 (68 pp)
11: 1983 (34 pp)
12: 1984 (33 pp)
13: 1985 (37 pp)
14: 1986 (54 pp)

Studies:

1. J.J. Keleher & K. Z. Hendin. "Manitoba Problems & Public Opinion".

2. W. G. Leitch & J.J. Keleher, "Garrison Diversion Project Presentations" (1974), 61 pp.

3. J.J. Keleher, "Manitoba Environmental Agencies and Activities" (1974), 4 pp.

4. D. H. Boyd, "Impacts of the Garrison Diversion Unit on Canada" (1975), 177pp.

5. K. B. Richmond & J.J. Keleher, "Manitoba 2000. Population Size and Distribution" (1975), 130 pp.

6. Ken Arenson, Chair, "Nuclear Energy: Fact and Fantasy" (1975), 35 pp.

7. H.J. Selwood. "The Winnipeg Townscape: A Survey Guide" (1975), 35 pp.

8. William Bell, Chair, "Rural Land Use Conflict: Some Solutions" (1977), 130 pp.

9. W. J. Turnock, Chair, "The Energy Issue: Demand and Supply" (1977), 162 pp.

10. Alex Fedoruk, Chair, "Manitoba Water Quality Objectives: How Far Do We Go?" (1978), 145 pp.

11. Peter Aitchison, Chair, "Trees and Pesticides: An Environmental Dilemma" (1978), 37 pp.

12. Ken Arenson, Chair, "Winnipeg 100: Alternative Futures" (1978), 112 pp.

13. Rosemary Malaher, Chair, "Environmental Education: Hope for the Future" (1979), 51 pp.

14. John Jack, Chair, "Parks for Manitoba: Policy and Practice" (1981), 48 pp.

15. David Punter, Chair, "10th Anniversary Celebration" (1982), 41 pp.

Topics:

1. J.B. Nickels, Chair, "Environmental Quality Preferences:" (1982), 22 pp.

2. Anna E. Polonyi, "Wildlife Designation of Manitoba Crown Lands: Problems and Conflicts" (1984), 75 pp.

3. Lloyd Axworthy and Ken Arenson, Chairs, "Southern Indian Lake and Hydro Development" (1984), 73 pp.

4. A. Tompkins, L. Krampetz, D. Muir, and D. Malley, "Survey of Environmental Monitoring Programs in Manitoba" (1984), 46 pp.

5. Diane F. Malley, Chair, "Environmental Practices and Manitoba Hydro" (1987). 37 pp.

MEMBERSHIP REPORT

Olga Weber

Total Membership as of May 29, 1987, totalled 94 members made up of the following:

Organizations	38
Individuals	56
Total	94

Presented at the May 29, 1987 Annual Meeting.

MEMBERSHIP LIST

Honorary Members

Hon. Jay Cowan
Miss Catherine Howlett
Hon. Gerard Lecuyer
Dr. Thomas Owen

Charter Members

Dr. P. W. Aitchison, Winnipeg
J. F. Palamarchuk, Winnipeg
Dr. W. O. Pruitt Jr., Winnipeg

Council Members

Dr. P. W. Aitchison, Winnipeg
Mr. Bill Aitken, Arborg
Mr. A. G. Allan, Winnipeg
Mr. Hugh Arklie, Morden
Dr. P. W. Arntfield, Winnipeg
Mr. R. M. Austman, Altona
Mr. John Barker, Winnipeg
Ms. Cindy Blicq, Winnipeg
Mr. Andy Burzynski, Winnipeg

Dr. Wayne Cowan, Winnipeg
Ms. Lissa Desbarats, Winnipeg
Mr. Robert Despins, Winnipeg
Dr. P.E. Doyle, Winnipeg
Mr. Herold Driedger, Winnipeg
Mr. Jack Dubois, Winnipeg,
Mr. Martin Egan,Winnipeg
Mr. Kenneth Emberley, Winnipeg
Ms. Dorris Fillion, Winnipeg
Mr. Timothy Fultz, Winnipeg
Mr. Don Glays, Winnipeg
Mrs. Irene Grant, Winnipeg
Ms. Barbara A. Harding, Winnipeg
Mr. Rick D. Howard, Seddon's Corner
Mr. Bob Imrie, Flin Flon
Mr. C. Robert Inman, Winnipeg
Mr. Laverne Jaeb, The Pas
Mr. Mike James, Lockport
Mr. E. B. Johanson, The Pas
Mr. Chris Kaufmann, Winnipeg
Mrs. Barb Kendel, Winnipeg
Mr. J. A. Knight, MacDonald
Ms. Nancy Kolofa, Winnipeg
Mr. Ken Lacroix, Thompson
Mr. Harold A. Laine, Winnipeg
Mr. William Langford, Winnipeg
Dr. A. M. Lansdown, Winnipeg
Mr. Gilbert Lathin, The Pas
Mr. H. P. Laws, Winnipeg
Mr. R. Lepischak, Neepawa
Dr. Diane F. Malley, Winnipeg
Dr. A. C. Maniar, Winnipeg
Mr. Jayesh Maniar, Winnipeg
Ms. Ruth Marr, Winnipeg
Mr. Rod McMillan, Selkirk
Mr. Larry Milian, Winnipeg
Dr. D. Muir, Winnipeg
Mr. Dennis Muldrew, Winnipeg
Mr. Wayne Neily, Winnipeg
Dr. J. B. Nickels, Winnipeg
Mr. Harvey Olson, Scanterbury
Mr. Bohdan J. Palamarchuk, Winnipeg
Mrs. Betty Pawlicki, Winnipeg
Mr. Russ Phillips, Dauphin
Dr. Eva Pip, Winnipeg
Mr. Peter Priess, Winnipeg
Dr. William O. Pruitt, Jr., Winnipeg
Dr. David Punter, Winnipeg
Mr. Terence J. Rempel, Morden
Prof. J. M. Richtik, Winnipeg
Dr. Carl Ridd, Winnipeg
Mr. J. D. Robertson, Dauphin
Dr. I. M. Rollo, Winnipeg
Prof. Basil M. Rotoff, Winnipeg
Mr. Masih Sabet, Winnipeg
Mr. Harv Sawatzky, Winnipeg
Ms. Ingrid Schram, Winnipeg
Prof. H. J. Selwood, Winnipeg
Dr. Jennifer Shay, Winnipeg
Mr. Eugene Sheremeta, Winnipeg Beach
Mr. Barry Silver, The Pas
Mr. Jimm Simon, Stonewall
Mr. Roger Smith, Brandon
Mr. Chrish Sundevic, Thompson
Mr. Keith Taylor, Winnipeg
Mr. Jim Tomko, Winnipeg
Mr. Marc R. Trottier, Winnipeg
Dr. W. J. Turnock, Winnipeg
Mr. Murray W. Wagner, Winnipeg
Ms. Jenny Rose Ward, Winnipeg
Dr. P. D. Watts, Churchill
Mrs. Olga Weber, Winnipeg
Mr. Barry Wild, Winnipeg
Dr. A. Yassi, Winnipeg

COUNCIL ORGANIZATIONS

Association of Manitoba Archaeologists
Broken Head Indian Band
Canadian Institute of Forestry
Citizenship Council of Manitoba
Eastern Regional Development Corporation Inc.
Entomological Society of Manitoba
Interlake Development Corporation Inc.
Junior League of Winnipeg
Keystone Agricultural Producers
Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses
Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities
Manitoba Bar Association
Manitoba Chamber of Commerce
Manitoba Farm Business Association
Manitoba Federation of Labour
Manitoba Forestry Association Inc.
Manitoba Institute of Agrologists

Manitoba Medical Association
Manitoba Naturalists Society
Manitoba Parks and Recreation Association
Manitoba Real Estate Association
Manitoba Teachers Society
Manitoba Wildlife Federation
Norman Regional Development Corporation
Parkland Regional Development Corporation
Pembina Valley Regional Development Corporation
Selkirk - Town Council
Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research Centre
Union of Manitoba Municipalities
United Steelworkers of America (Local 7106)
United Steelworkers of America (Local 6166)
Wildlife Society, Man. Chapter
Winnipeg - City Council
Winnipeg Labour Council

REPORT OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee consisted of A. Maniar, B. Rotoff, and D. Muir.

Recommendations:

EXECUTIVE:
Chair, Dr. Ian Rollo
Vice Chair, Mr. Herold Driedger
Secretary, Mrs. Betty Pawlicki
Past Chair, Dr. Diane Malley

STANDING COMMITTEES - Chairs
Membership Committee, Mrs. Olga Weber
Publication Committee, Mr. Jayesh Maniar
Bylaws, Miss Catherine Howlett

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES - Chairs
Education - Mr. Marc Trottier
Energy - Mr. Martin Egan
Environmental Chemicals - W. J. Turnock
Environmental Impact Assesmt., Prof. Basil Rotoff
Land Use - Mr. Dennis Muldrew
Water & Waste - Dr. Atish Maniar
Wildlife - Mr. Barry Wild

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES - Chairs
Winnipeg - Mrs. Betty Pawlicki
Eastern - Mr. Rick Howard
Parkland - Mr. Barry Wild
Central Plains - Mr. J. A. Knight
Interlake - Mr. Bill Aitken
Northern - Mr. Ed Johanson
Pembina Valley - Mr. Hugh Arklie

PAST COUNCIL CHAIRS

The first organizational meeting of the Manitoba Environmental Council was held on January 28, 1972, when various task forces were set up to establish the Council's direction and operation. The following have served as the Council's Chairs:

1972-73 Lloyd Axworthy
1973-74 Lloyd Axworthy (to December 5, 1973)
Ken Arenson (balance of term)
1974-75 Ken Arenson
1975-76 Allen M. Landsdown
1976-77 W. J. Turnock
1977-78 Onno Kremers
1978-79 David Punter
1979-80 Rosemary Malaher
1980-81 Basil M. Rotoff
1981-82 Bill Kennedy
1982-83 Bill Kennedy
1983-84 Atish Maniar
1984-85 Atish Maniar
1985-86 Diane Malley
1986-87 Diane Malley

Council Staff

Keri Barringer - Coordinator

FINANCES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Manitoba Environmental Council is funded by a legislative appropriation to the Environmental Management Division.

Fiscal Year	Voted	Expended	Per Cent
1971-72	N/A	N/A	N/A
1972-73	2,500	N/A	N/A
1973-74	18,200	7,400	41
1974-75	17,100	15,000	88
1975-76	15,000	16,200	108
1976-77	13,100	11,700	89
1977-78	16,300	15,132	93
1978-79	16,900	16,621	98
1979-80	16,900	20,432	121
1980-81	16,900	16,894	99
1981-82	25,800	27,437	106
1982-83	28,400	36,144	127
1983-84	27,700	18,558	67
1984-85	12,700	23,067	172
1985-86	12,900	25,700	199
1986-87	12,900	17,500	135

EXPENDITURES 1986/87 FISCAL YEAR

Operating Budget	$12,900
Additional Finances	5,500
TOTAL	$18,400
Travel	$ 5,500
Hotel/Meals	3,700
Office Supplies /Courier/Rentals	2,200
Comp/Publications/WP	,400
Miscellaneous	1,700
TOTAL	$17,500
Remaining	$ 900

COLOPHON

Cover:	Queen's Printer
Typography:	Typeface
Editor:	Keri Barringer
ISSN:	0380-9803
Published:	May 1988